

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned office action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-20, were rejected. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13-18, and 20 were rejected under Section 102(b) over Snellman. And, claims 5 and 19 were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Snellman and Stadelmann.

Responsive to the rejection of the claims, independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended, in manners as set forth herein, believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Various of the dependent claims have been amended responsive to amendments made to their parent claims, and claims 4 and 14 have been cancelled.

To the extent that the Examiner asserts that Snellman discloses a transposer, or operation of transposing, recited in the amended claims, as now-amended, such assertion is respectfully traversed. The applicant further traverses the Examiner's reliance upon Snellman for showing an indexer, or corresponding operation of indexing, also as now-recited.

Specifically, and with respect to exemplary claim 1, an indexer is recited that indexes together a first short dialing code and a corresponding first network-part identifier code that is returned to the mobile node. And, a transposer is recited that operates responsive to initiation of a call placement using the first mobile-node identifier into a network-part code. Claim 13 recites analogous operations.

Review of Snellman indicates that, in contrast to indexing together of values and subsequent transposing of codes, different operation and structure is instead utilized. Page 8, lines 4-9 indicate that a predetermined telephone number, or several numbers, are returned to a mobile telephone unit, the returned numbers are not indexed by an indexer or transposed, all as recited in the amended claims. Rather, lines 10-15 of page 8 disclose that the "various local numbers are not stored in the telephone unit but the specific local number information [that] is

received...and then stored for use in that specific local network. New information from another network will replace the previous information”.

Indexing and transposing is not performed. Rather, existing numbers are written over. Snellman not only fails to disclose the structure and operation recited in the claims, as-amended, but, further, discloses a scheme that is directly contrary to that now-recited. And, Stadlemann was neither cited for showing, nor appears to show, the structure or operation, recited, as now-amended.

The remaining dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims and are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references for the same reasons as those just-given with respect to their parent claims.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 13, as now-amended, and the remaining ones of the dependent claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@schceefandstone.com